



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

There are few typographical errors, although in several passages even a German must feel the need of interrogation points. There is no attempt at uniformity in the use of *i* and *u* before *m* in superlatives or of *u* and *o* after *v*. In a book otherwise so convenient to use it is a pity that the numerous quotations from the poets in the text are not spaced on separate lines so that their character can be seen at a glance.

SMITH COLLEGE

FLORENCE ALDEN GRAGG

Nonni Panopolitani Dionysiaca. Recensuit ARTHURUS LUDWICH.
Leipzig: Teubner, 1909-11. Vol. I, pp. xxiv+500; Vol. II,
pp. 556.

For many years the editor has been a student of the *Dionysiaca*. As early as 1875 he made a collation of the Laurentian codex (L), and two years later as a result of this and other study published in *Hermes* XII 274 ff. an article describing and discussing the many kinds of errors found in the text of the poem. Again, in *Rhein. Mus.* N.F. XLII (1887) 233-38 he published a collection of passages from the *Dionysiaca* imitated, as he holds, from the writings of Gregory Nazianzen. But these two articles represent only a very small portion of the work which the learned scholar was doing on the poem. He collated all the manuscripts known to him, studied the various editions and the emendations of various scholars, collecting a great mass of critical matter for the better understanding of the poem, reserving it for his personal use, and with no thought of making a new edition of the poem. This modest plan was changed by a fortunate circumstance. In the *Berliner Klassikertexte*, Heft 5 (1907), 1. Hälfte, pp. 94-106, were published some fragments of an Egyptian papyrus containing portions of Books 14, 15, and 16 of the *Dionysiaca*. Though the lines were barely three hundred in number, they were sufficient to establish the essential correctness of the editor's conjectures made with the aid of L. This it was that led him, though reluctant, to undertake the drudgery of a new edition in which the results of his studies should be readily accessible to scholars. The work is very properly dedicated, "Alberto Zimmermann Quinti Smyrnaei Sospitatori Amico."

In the Preface the editor discusses some matters with reference to the poem which had not hitherto been definitely determined. The probable date of the poem is fixed at 390-405. The name of the author was unknown to scholars for a long period. It is not mentioned by Eustathius, who quotes from the poem, nor by the editor of the *Etymologicum magnum* nor by Suidas. The name was known, however, to Angelus Politian. His knowledge of it was probably gained from a passage in the histories of Agathias Myrinaeus, quoted by our editor, in which two lines of the poem are given with the author's name. But it was not found on the oldest manuscript, L,

nor on its one copy. It is found, however, on the fragments of Egyptian papyrus mentioned above, in this edition designated as II. Hence the editor believes that there were two classes of manuscripts, the one lacking the author's name and perhaps a few lines of the poem, represented by L; the other complete and containing the author's name, represented by II. But II, as has been said, is only a fragment. From L, a manuscript of the thirteenth century, was copied the Codex Palatinus-Heidelbergensis (P) of the sixteenth century, and all the other manuscripts are derived from P.

The peculiar merit of the present edition is that it is the first in which any serious effort has been made to make use of the readings of more than one or two manuscripts. The *editio princeps* of Falkenburg was copied from an inferior manuscript and reproduced its errors, which were copied by edition after edition down to and including Koechly's. For although Koechly had used the Codex Monacensis to advantage, he admits that he "treads in the footsteps of De Graefe," the preceding editor. In the present edition, on the other hand, we have the results, not only of a study of the fragments of papyrus, but also of a collation of L and P, the best existing manuscripts, and of the older editions and the emendations of those who have worked on the text. We find the readings of II and L given with fulness and a copious selection from other manuscripts and the editions, all of which have been reduced to the form of an index, so that reference to them is considerably abbreviated. From the *apparatus criticus* which is placed at the foot of the page the reader can readily learn the more important readings. No one will hesitate to grant the editor's modest claim to be the historian of the text. But he is much more. He is also editor. We believe that the readings adopted in this edition will be generally accepted. They everywhere give evidence of common-sense and conservatism on the part of the editor. Much has been gained from the better manuscripts at his service. Many of the readings of former editions are adopted, sometimes against the concurrent reading of all the manuscripts. The "scripsi's" are comparatively few, very few considering the state of the text, and usually they are convincing. The lacunae are still numerous. Seldom does the editor fail to agree with Koechly in this matter. Had he been less conservative he would have filled in more gaps in the text than he has done. The passages in which there has been some disarrangement of the lines are about as numerous as the lacunae. The rare attempts of the editor to rearrange them have not been attended with much success. At best the rearrangement of lines is very much like pulling at the end of a tangled skein. The present editor deserves credit for following the manuscripts in many instances even though the meaning is left obscure. It seems obvious that there was often original obscurity.

It would be presumptuous in one who has not had long acquaintance with the *Dionysiaca* to venture on minute criticism. But the general excellence

of this edition is apparent and it will supersede Koechly's. At last we have a text which makes the poem not only readable but even enjoyable.

I have noted one misprint: $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\pi\omega$ (22.2) for $\kappa\acute{o}\lambda\pi\omega$; in some instances Koechly is not given credit for readings corrected in his Preface, e.g., $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\eta}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ and other words in $\eta\rho\omicron\varsigma$ without iota subscript in 3.413; 5.9; 10.100, etc. It is evident that the references to parallel passages in Homer and other authors could be easily added to, though the editor deserves thanks for indicating for the first time many in authors seldom read.

G. W. PASCHAL

WAKE FOREST, N.C.

Q. *Horatius Flaccus*. Erklärt von ADOLF KIESSLING. Zweiter Teil: *Satiren*. Vierte Auflage besorgt von RICHARD HEINZE. Berlin: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1910. Pp. xxxiii+299. M. 3.50.

The merits of Kiessling's edition of Horace are well known. In a seven-line preface Heinze declares that, though the present edition of the *Sermones* differs less from the third edition than that had differed from the second (prepared by Kiessling himself), still in numerous places he has made alterations by abbreviations or additions. The additions are not indicated by any typographical device; to find them (or other changes) one must compare this edition line by line with its predecessor. In accordance with the excellent German fashion, so superior to our own, the book has been reset throughout.

The present edition contains xxxiii+299 pages against xxxii+284 of the third. Part of the apparent increase is due to more open composition, which improves the appearance of the book and makes it easier to read.

In the *Einleitung*, in the first part dealing with "Die horazische Satire" (ix-xxii) there is little change. There is less dogmatism on p. x concerning Livy's account (7.2) of the Italian forms of the drama; the suggestion that Accius was Livy's source (cf. Hendrickson, *Am. Jour. Phil.* IX, 285-311) has been withdrawn. Kiessling's suggestion that Livy's source, in writing of the *Satura*, was seeking in Latin literature an analogue to the $\Sigma\acute{\alpha}\tau\upsilon\rho\omicron\iota$ (a suggestion which has always seemed to me to have sprung from a misunderstanding or perversion of what O. Jahn wrote in *Hermes* 2. 225-26) has also been withdrawn. One or two other slight changes on pp. x-xi show the influence of the views set forth by Marx (in the *Prolegomena* to his *Lucilius*). On p. x Heinze refrains from stating the birth year of Lucilius (in the 3d edition [1906] he gave it as 180: so in 1904 Marx, *Lucilius* i, xxii); on 2.1.34 he holds that Lucilius cannot have been "beträchtlich jünger als sein Freund Scipio (geb. 184)." He seems to have overlooked the discussion of the matter in Sellar *Roman Poets of the Republic* 231, in Cichorius *Untersuchungen*